

TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

[Approved 5.11.2018]

Below are the procedures regarding Tenure and Promotion for the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Music, the School of Business Administration and the duPont-Ball Library at Stetson University (hereafter referred to as “University” procedures). Each of the Schools, Divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Library articulates in writing a separate disciplinary interpretation of the tenure and promotion standards for scholarship and creative activities, consistent with the University standards. For candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the disciplinary articulation of standards for scholarship and creative activities that were in effect at the time of their initial appointment applies. Candidates applying for promotion to Professor can choose to be evaluated by the 2010 standards for promotion to Professor and the disciplinary articulation of standards for scholarship and creative activities originally adopted to supplement the 2010 Promotion and Tenure policy or by the standards for promotion to Professor and disciplinary articulation of standards for scholarship and creative activities in effect at the time of their application for promotion to Professor. Candidates applying for tenure will be evaluated by the standards for tenure and promotion and disciplinary articulation of standards for scholarship and creative activities in effect at the time of their hire. Associate Professors and Professors – those hired at advanced rank – who are applying for tenure will be judged by the criteria for tenure and promotion (from Assistant to Associate) in effect at the time of their initial appointment. Any special circumstances that may have been negotiated at the time of initial appointment and that are relevant to subsequent tenure and promotion considerations, or any that may have been subsequently renegotiated, need to be clearly articulated in a letter from the Provost; that letter should be shared with the candidate, and a copy will become part of the candidate’s tenure and promotion portfolio.

Periodically, the University will sponsor informational workshops providing specific details about the tenure and promotion process and procedure.

Section I: Procedures for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Principles for Pre-Tenure Review

The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to (i) provide tenure-track faculty feedback on progress toward tenure, (ii) identify areas needing improvement, and (iii) provide guidance in preparing the professional portfolio to support the review for tenure. All tenure track faculty members shall also comply with discipline-specific expectations developed by each School, Division, and academic department or Library.

1. Pre-tenure Review is a formative and evaluative process based on review of the candidate's second-year and fourth-year portfolios. All letters of evaluation must include a candid, thorough, and constructively critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service, with explicit reference to how they relate to tenure and promotion standards – disciplinary and University-wide – and the degree to which the candidate is on track towards meeting them (as supported by the evidence).
2. Pre-tenure Review evaluations and related conversations are intended to be not merely summative, but explicitly *suggestive* as to how the candidate can improve upon his/her professional performance and prospects for tenure.
3. An important goal of the Fourth-Year Review is a clear assessment of the candidate's potential for success in the subsequent tenure and promotion process. If any questions emerge about the candidate's potential for success in that process, the candidate may request advice from the Department Chair (or the appropriate alternate, as described below) and/or the Dean about his/her options moving forward.

B. Preparation for Pre-Tenure Review:

1. A timeline for the pre-tenure review process will be announced at the beginning of the academic year by the Office of Academic Affairs.
2. The Department Chair, Dean, and/or Provost may initiate a pre-tenure review during any pre-tenure appointment year that they deem appropriate, but typically they are initiated and conducted in the 2nd and 4th years of pre-tenure service.
3. Department Chairs typically conduct pre-tenure reviews. In the unusual event of an untenured candidate who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean or Associate Dean appoints an alternate Chair for the Pre-Tenure Review and any other ad hoc faculty appointments deemed necessary in accordance with appropriate Faculty Annual Review policies on the Academic Affairs web site. Subsequent references to "Chair" in this document are intended to incorporate such alternate arrangements when and where they apply.
4. Chair Coordinates Peer Observations of Teaching:
 - a. Department Chairs are responsible for coordinating and scheduling peer observations of teaching for pre-tenure members of their Department. There should be a minimum of one peer observation per semester until the candidate is either tenured and promoted, or has received her/his one-year terminal appointment. Peer observations should be conducted across a

representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be done by different peer observers.

b. Peer observers are selected from among tenured members of the candidate's department; for small departments or for candidates with interdisciplinary or joint appointments, peer observers may include other tenured faculty colleagues who possess unique and valuable expertise in the candidate's discipline.

c. Peer observations are carried out in accordance with the guidelines specified in the document, "Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching," posted on the Academic Affairs tenure and promotion website.

i. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement.

ii. The observer/evaluator sets up a meeting with the candidate within two weeks following the original observation. The meeting should be based on a draft of the written report of the observer/evaluator, made available to the candidate prior to the meeting. These meetings provide an opportunity to share perspectives, to offer constructive feedback, and to consider strategies for addressing classroom challenges.

iii. The candidate has the option to respond in writing to peer observation reports.

iv. Final peer observation reports must be signed by the observer/evaluator and forwarded to the Chair.

d. Peer observation reports and the candidate's responses, if applicable, are included in the candidate's FARs and thereby become part of the candidate's Pre-tenure Review portfolio.

5. Candidate Assembles Pre-Tenure Review Portfolio

The candidate must prepare a portfolio and submit it to the Chair by the date specified in the tenure and promotion calendar. The portfolio should include evidence that demonstrates the candidate is on track towards meeting the appropriate University and disciplinary standards for tenure and promotion. Portfolios must include the following information, complete since the date of employment:

a. An introductory section:

i. A copy of the letter from the Provost appointing the candidate to his/her current position and rank. Any alternative tenure and/or promotion plans and/or timelines under which the candidate's application is to be considered must be spelled out in this letter of appointment. Salary and other personal information should be redacted.

ii. An updated curriculum vitae.

iii. All Faculty Annual Reviews (FARs), Department Chair responses to the FARs, and the candidate's responses (if applicable). All these items should be placed together in the portfolio in chronological order. In the case of a candidate who serves as Department Chair, appropriate Faculty Annual Review policies on the Academic Affairs web site apply.

iv. A copy of the relevant disciplinary articulation of University standards for tenure and promotion (downloadable from the Academic Affairs web site).

b. A section on teaching/librarianship, which includes:

i. A thoughtful, introspective narrative (no more than 2,500 words long) on the candidate's teaching/librarianship in the context of his/her discipline. Candidates are encouraged to discuss intersections between their teaching/librarianship, research/creative/scholarly work, and service/leadership.

ii. Complete student teaching evaluations, including all written student comments, for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University. All these items should be placed together in the portfolio in chronological order.

iii. Representative course syllabi from all courses taught during the review period and other evidence of effective teaching/librarianship, e.g. assignments, grading rubrics, presentations, and other materials. All these items should be placed together in the portfolio in chronological order. For courses which are duplicated over multiple sections or offerings in different semesters, the candidate may choose to include only the most recent syllabus as the representative example.

iv. All written and signed peer teaching observation reports.

c. A section on research/scholarship/creative activities, which includes:

i. A thoughtful, introspective narrative (no more than 2,500 words) on the candidate's scholarship/creative activities in the context of the discipline. Candidates must describe or quantify their specific contributions to any co-authored work, publication, or grant. Candidates are encouraged to discuss intersections between their research/creative/scholarly work, teaching/librarianship, and service/leadership.

ii. Copies of all pertinent research/scholarship/creative activities material. All these items should be placed together in the portfolio in chronological order.

d. A section on service/leadership, which includes:

i. A thoughtful, introspective narrative (no more than 2,500 words) on the candidate's service/leadership activities in the university, the candidate's field, and the community. Candidates are encouraged to discuss intersections between their research/creative/scholarly work, teaching/librarianship, and service/leadership.

ii. Documented evidence of service (department, College/School/Library, University, professional, and civic engagement), noting the candidate's level of contribution to each service activity. All these items should be placed together in the portfolio in chronological order.

6. Candidate Presents Pre-Tenure Review Portfolio to Chair

a. The candidate presents the completed portfolio to the Chair by the date specified on the University calendar. From this point on, no new materials may be added to the portfolio by the candidate.

C. Department-level Pre-Tenure Review

1. The Chair writes a list of all members participating in the Departmental-Level Pre-Tenure Review and adds it to the portfolio. Only tenured faculty may participate in the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review.

2. The Chair circulates the candidate's portfolio among the faculty participating in the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review.

3. The Chair solicits evaluation letters from all tenured department/ program colleagues and, if applicable, from ad hoc outside members of the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review.

a. These letters should assess the candidate's performance on each University and divisional standard and provide justification for that assessment by explicitly referencing, drawing on, and citing pertinent evidence from the portfolio.

b. The Chair writes his/her own letter of evaluation.

4. The Chair coordinates at least one meeting of all members of the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review to discuss the candidate's progress toward meeting the standards for promotion and tenure. Discussion should be based, at least in part, on the initial drafts of evaluation letters written by members of the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review.

a. Following the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review meeting(s), members turn in a final draft of their letters of evaluation to the Chair.

b. The Chair adds the letters of evaluation to the confidential section of the portfolio and does not share them with the candidate.

5. Chair writes summary recommendation from Department-level Pre-Tenure Review.

a. The Chair prepares a written summary of the departmental colleague letters and the meetings of the Department-level Pre-Tenure Review committee. The summary letter must make explicit reference to University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence. To ensure confidentiality, this summary letter is not shared with other members of the Department. The Chair's summary letter must culminate in one of the following recommendations to the Dean:

i. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment

ii. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and recommend another review during the next year to address areas of weakness

iii. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal contract

b. The Chair shares this letter with the candidate.

c. The University tenure and promotion calendar will allow the candidate a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired.

d. The Chair forwards the portfolio, his/her Pre-tenure Review summary letter, and the candidate's response (if applicable) to the Dean.

D. College-Level Pre-Tenure Review

1. The Dean responds to the candidate's Pre-tenure Review portfolio in writing – with explicit reference to University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence – by the date indicated on the University calendar. The Dean should write his/her letter before discussing the matter with the Provost or the President. The Dean's letter must culminate in one of the following recommendations to the Provost:

a. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment

b. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and recommend another review in the following year to address areas of weakness

c. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal appointment

2. The Dean shares this letter of recommendation with the candidate.

3. The University tenure and promotion calendar will allow the candidate ~~has~~ a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired.

4. The Dean forwards the portfolio, the Dean's letter of recommendation, and the candidate's response (if applicable) to the Provost.

E. University-level Pre-Tenure Review

1. Upon considering the evidence in the pre-tenure review portfolios of all Pre-Tenure Review candidates, the Provost consults with the appropriate Deans and Chairs regarding those candidates whose pre-tenure reviews reflect deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.

2. The Provost informs the candidate in writing – with explicit reference to University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence – of the personnel decision(s) resulting

from the pre-tenure reviews by the date indicated on the University calendar. The Provost's response must culminate in one of the following decisions:

- a. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment
- b. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and require a review in the following year to address areas of weakness
- c. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal appointment

3. The Provost retains the confidential letters of recommendation for candidates whose tenure-track contracts are terminated as a result of pre-tenure review. For candidates whose tenure-track contracts are renewed, the Provost returns these confidential letters to the Dean, who retains the letters and adds them to the candidate's subsequent Tenure and Promotion portfolio.

Section II: Procedures for Application for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor

A. Principles for Tenure and Promotion

1. The following procedure articulates the responsibilities of the agents involved in the processes of applying for promotion and/or tenure and reviewing such applications, and it enumerates the steps through which each application will pass.

2. Reviewers at each stage of the application procedure must evaluate fully an application for tenure and/or promotion, unless the candidate has withdrawn the application.

3. *Letters of evaluation* are written by members of the department-level review and submitted to the Chair of the department-level review. In this document they are also referred to as *evaluation letters* or *letters of evaluation*. All *letters of evaluation* will be structured into sections:

- teaching/librarianship
- scholarship/creative activities
- service/leadership.

In each section, the evaluator will provide a candid, thorough, and critical assessment of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in each area, and the degree to which the candidate has met standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor.

4. Reviews of applications for tenure and/or promotion are summative only. Thus, suggestions for improving performance are not appropriate in these reviews.

5. *Recommendations whether to tenure and/or promote* are written by Chairs of department-level reviews, members of College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion committees, members of the University Tenure and Promotion committee, Deans, and the Provost. In this document they are also referred to as *summary recommendations* and as *written recommendations*. All *recommendations whether to tenure and/or promote* must contain explicit reference to University standards, disciplinary articulations, and pertinent evidence provided in the portfolio, and culminate in one of the following recommendations:

- a. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
- b. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
- c. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor

B. Preparation for Tenure and Promotion Application

1. Candidate Initiates the Application for Tenure and/or Promotion One Year in Advance

- a. Each year, the Office of Academic Affairs will announce a timeline for the tenure and promotion process (tenure and promotion calendar).
- b. Faculty members are welcome to discuss opportunities for tenure and/or promotion with Department Chairs and Deans at any time.
- c. Candidates considering an application for promotion to Professor need to notify the Department Chair and Dean of this possibility at least one year in advance so that faculty participating in the department-level review can be notified. If circumstances necessitate (e.g. the Department Chair is untenured or the candidate *is* the Chair), the Dean or Associate Dean will appoint an alternate Chair for the department-level review and any other ad hoc faculty appointments in accordance with appropriate policies found on the Academic Affairs website. Subsequent references to the “Chair” are intended to incorporate such alternate arrangements when and where they apply.
- d. Candidates are responsible for making their own best cases in support of a positive tenure and/or promotion decision. Candidates may withdraw their applications at any point in the process. While candidates applying for promotion to Professor may reapply at a later date, candidates for tenure (with or without promotion) may not.
- e. Associate and Professors – those hired at advanced rank – who are applying for tenure will be judged by the criteria for tenure and promotion (from Assistant to Associate) in effect at the time of their initial appointment.

2. Chair Coordinates Peer Observations of Teaching

- a. The Chair will coordinate peer observations of the candidate’s teaching to ensure that a sufficient number of observations have been completed. Peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be done by different peer observers. Peer observations will be carried out in accordance with the guidelines specified in the document Peer Observation of Teaching posted on the Academic Affairs tenure and promotion website (e.g. only tenured faculty may conduct peer evaluations). Peer observation reports and the candidate’s responses, if applicable, will be included in the candidate’s FARs.
- b. For candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, a minimum of one peer observation per semester should be completed. For such pre-tenure faculty, peer observers will be selected from among the tenured faculty members who are participating in the department-level review as defined above.

- c. Applications for promotion to Professor must include a minimum of three peer observations that have been completed during semesters that precede the application for promotion, with at least two of these peer observations occurring during different semesters. Ordinarily, peer observers for candidates applying for promotion to Professor should include tenured faculty members who are participating in the department-level review, but can also include other tenured faculty colleagues who possess unique and valuable expertise in the candidate's discipline.

3. Candidate and Chair Solicit External Evaluation of Scholarship/Creative Activity

- a. Candidates applying for promotion to Professor are required to have their scholarship/creative activities evaluated by two or more external reviewers. All external reviews will be carried out in accordance with the guidelines specified in the document *External Review of Scholarship and/or Creative Activities*, maintained on the Academic Affairs tenure and promotion website.
 - i. To initiate the external review process, the candidate must submit to the Chair the names of 4-5 faculty or professionals with relevant disciplinary expertise, external to Stetson University, who may serve as potential reviewers for the scholarship/creative work portion of the portfolio. The Office of Academic Affairs will publish the date by which the candidate must submit names to the Chair each year in the tenure and promotion calendar. The candidate should recommend potential external reviewers with whom he/she has no personal or professional ties that could compromise the review.
 - ii. The Chair will contact individuals from the submitted list of names and will identify at least two who are willing to serve as external reviewers. The Chair will place letters written by external reviewers in the portfolio prior to the department-level review. External review letters will not be shared with the candidate.
- b. Applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor do not require external reviews of scholarship or creative activity, but candidates are welcome to request that the Chair solicit external reviews in support of the application; in such cases, the external letter process must follow all the guidelines above.

4. Candidate Assembles Portfolio

The candidate must prepare a portfolio and submit it to the Chair by the date specified in the tenure and promotion calendar. The portfolio should include evidence that demonstrates the candidate has met or exceeded the appropriate University standards for tenure and promotion. Portfolios must include the following information, complete since the date of employment or date of last promotion:

- a. An introductory section:
 - i. The portfolio checklist (downloadable from the Academic Affairs tenure and promotion website). The candidate is required to sign the portfolio checklist, confirming that all required items are present, or that an explanation why required items are missing has been offered. All such explanations will be appended to the portfolio checklist.
 - ii. A copy of the letter from the Provost appointing the candidate to his/her current position and rank. Any alternative tenure and/or promotion plans and/or timelines under which the candidate's application is to be considered must be spelled out in this letter of appointment. Salary and other personal information should be redacted.
 - iii. An updated curriculum vitae.
 - iv. All Faculty Annual Reviews (FARs), Department Chair responses to the FARs, and the candidate's responses (if applicable). All these items should be placed together in the portfolio in chronological order.
 - v. A copy of the relevant disciplinary articulation of University standards for tenure and promotion (downloadable from the Academic Affairs web site).
- b. A section on teaching/librarianship, which includes
 - i. A thoughtful, introspective narrative (no more than 2,500 words long) on the candidate's teaching/librarianship in the context of his/her discipline. Candidates are encouraged to discuss intersections between their teaching/librarianship, research/creative/scholarly work, and service/leadership.
 - ii. Complete student teaching evaluations, including all written student comments, for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period (or the period since the candidate's last promotion) at Stetson University.
 - iii. Representative course syllabi of all courses taught at Stetson during the period presented in the portfolio, as well as other evidence of effective teaching/librarianship, e.g. assignments, grading rubrics,

presentations, and other materials. For courses which are duplicated over multiple sections or offerings in different semesters, the candidate may choose to include only the most recent syllabus as the representative example.

- iv. All written and signed peer teaching observation reports by colleagues, as defined in the “Peer Observations of Teaching” section above.
- c. A section on research/scholarship/creative activities, which includes
 - i. A thoughtful, introspective narrative (no more than 2,500 words) on the candidate’s scholarship/creative activities in the context of the discipline. Candidates must describe or quantify their specific contributions to any co- authored work, publication, or grant. Candidates are encouraged to discuss intersections between their research/creative/scholarly work, teaching/librarianship, and service/leadership.
 - ii. Copies of all pertinent research/scholarship/creative activities material.
- d. A section on service/leadership, which includes
 - i. A thoughtful, introspective narrative (no more than 2,500 words) on the candidate’s service/leadership activities in the university, the candidate’s field, and the community. Candidates are encouraged to discuss intersections between their research/creative/scholarly work, teaching/librarianship, and service/leadership.
 - ii. Documented evidence of service (department, College/School/Library, University, professional, and civic engagement), noting the candidate’s level of contribution to each service activity.

5. Candidate Presents Portfolio to Chair

- a. By the date specified in the University tenure and promotion calendar, the candidate must present the completed portfolio to the Chair.
- b. The Chair is required to sign the portfolio checklist, confirming that all required items are present, or that an explanation why required items are missing has been offered. All such explanations will be appended to the portfolio checklist. Once the chair has signed the checklist, the only items

that may be added to the portfolio by any party are those letters identified in the review process outlined in this policy.

C. Department-Level Review

1. The Chair will write a list of all members participating in the Department-Level review and add it to the portfolio.

2. Chair Solicits and Accepts Evaluation Letters from Candidate's Colleagues

- a. The Chair will solicit written, signed letters of evaluation from all faculty participating in the Department-Level Review (these letters will not be shared with the candidate).
- b. Letters from other members of the University community, attesting to knowledge of the candidate's work outside the Department, should be submitted to the Chair by the date specified on the University tenure and promotion calendar.
- c. For cases where external evaluation has been carried out, the Chair will collect all letters written by external reviewers and label each on the first page "External Review."
- d. The Chair will also write and sign his or her own letter of evaluation (this Chair's letter will not be shared with the candidate).
- e. The Chair adds all evaluative letters to the confidential section of the portfolio and does not share them with the candidate.

3. Chair Circulates Portfolio and Coordinates Meetings

- a. The Chair circulates the portfolio among the faculty participating in the Department-Level Review.
- b. The Chair will coordinate at least one meeting of this faculty review group to discuss the candidate's progress toward meeting the relevant standards for promotion and tenure. Additional meetings will be scheduled as

needed.

4. Chair Writes Summary Recommendation from Department-Level Review

- a. The Chair will prepare a separate written summary recommendation of the department-level review, which addresses both evaluative letters and meetings held as part of the review. To ensure confidentiality, this summary letter is not shared with other members of the department-level review. The Chair's written summary recommendation will be shared with the candidate. The Chair's written summary recommendation must contain explicit reference to University standards, disciplinary articulations, and pertinent evidence provided in the portfolio, and culminate in one of the following recommendations:
 - i. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor¹
 - ii. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment²
 - iii. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor.

5. Chair Forwards Portfolio with All Materials from Department-Level Review to Dean

- a. The Chair will add to the portfolio his/her summary recommendation and all the evaluative letters written by members of the Department-Level review. The Chair will share only the chair's written summary with the candidate.
- b. The Chair is required to sign the portfolio checklist and must append a list enumerating each evaluative letter included in the portfolio; the Chair will include explanations of any discrepancies between the initial list of members of the Department-Level review and the list of evaluative letters. The Chair's signature confirms that all required items are present, or that an explanation why required items are missing has been offered. All such explanations will be appended to the portfolio checklist.
- c. The Chair will forward the portfolio to the Dean.

¹ In less common situations where candidates were hired at the level of Associate Professor or Professor and are applying only for tenure, the recommendation here and in parallel sections of this policy would be to award tenure.

² In less common situations where candidates were hired at the level of Associate Professor or Professor and are applying only for tenure, the recommendation here and in parallel sections of this policy would be to deny tenure and issue a one-year terminal contract.

D. College-Level Review

1. For candidates who are applying only for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the Dean will add to the portfolio copies of the pre-tenure review letters listed below (these letters are kept on file by the Dean after each pre-tenure review):

Chair's summary letter.

Dean's summary letter.

Responses from the candidate (if applicable).

2. Dean Forwards Portfolio to College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Dean will forward the portfolio, with requisite letters, to the College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee for a written recommendation.

3. College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee Reviews Portfolio

- a. The College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the portfolio forwarded from the Dean and formulate a written recommendation concerning the candidacy. The College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee's written recommendation must contain explicit reference to University standards, disciplinary articulations, and pertinent evidence provided in the portfolio, and culminate in one of the following recommendations:
 - i. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
 - ii. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
 - iii. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor.
- b. The College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee will add its written recommendation to the portfolio.
- c. The Chair of the College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee is required to sign the portfolio checklist, confirming that all required items are

present, or that an explanation why required items are missing has been offered. All such explanations will be appended to the portfolio checklist. The College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion committee will forward the portfolio to the Dean.

4. Dean Reviews Portfolio

The Dean will review the portfolio forwarded from the College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee and formulate a written recommendation concerning the candidacy. The Dean's written recommendation must contain explicit reference to University standards, disciplinary articulations, and pertinent evidence provided in the portfolio, and culminate in one of the following recommendations:

- i. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
- ii. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
- iii. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor.

5. Dean Shares College-Level Review Recommendations with Candidate

- a. The Dean will share with the candidate the College/School/Library written recommendation, the Dean's written recommendation, and the portfolio checklist to date.
- b. The candidate will have a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired.

6. Candidate May Respond to College/School/Library-Level Recommendations

The candidate may respond to correct factual errors; however, no other new material may be submitted. The candidate's written factual correction (if applicable) must accompany the portfolio through the remaining steps of the review process. A written response by the candidate at this stage of the review process does not constitute an appeal.

7. Dean May Meet with Candidate

The Dean has the option to meet with the candidate to discuss his/her candidacy.

8. Dean Forwards Portfolio to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee

- a. The Dean will add his/her written recommendation, as well as the written recommendation from the College/School/Library-Level review, to the portfolio, along with the candidate's written factual correction (if applicable).
- b. The Dean forwards the portfolio to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

E. University-Level Review

1. Provost Meets with University Tenure and Promotion Committee

The Provost will meet with the University Tenure and Promotion Committee to review its application of University standards, in order to ensure consistency.

2. University Tenure and Promotion Committee Reviews Portfolio

- a. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the portfolio forwarded from the Provost and formulate a written recommendation concerning the candidacy. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee's written recommendation must contain explicit reference to University standards, disciplinary articulations, and pertinent evidence provided in the portfolio, and culminate in one of the following recommendations:

- i. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
- ii. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
- iii. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor.

- b. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee will add its written recommendation to the portfolio.

3. University Tenure and Promotion Committee Forwards Portfolio to Provost

- a. The Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee is required to sign the portfolio checklist, confirming that all required items are present, or that an explanation why required items are missing has been offered. All such

explanations will be appended to the portfolio checklists.

- b. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee forwards the portfolio to the Provost.
- c. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee also shares its written recommendation with the candidate.

4. Provost Meets with Candidates Not Recommended for Tenure and/or Promotion

In consultation with the Dean and Chair, the Provost will meet with candidates who are not recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or for promotion to Professor.

5. Provost Reviews Portfolio

- a. The Provost will review the portfolio forwarded from the University Tenure and Promotion Committee and formulate a written recommendation concerning the candidacy. The Provost's written recommendation must contain explicit reference to University standards, disciplinary articulations, and pertinent evidence provided in the portfolio, and culminate in one of the following recommendations:
 - i. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
 - ii. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
 - iii. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor.

6. Provost Forwards Portfolio to President

- a. The Provost will add his/her written recommendation to the portfolio.
- b. The Provost will forward the portfolio to the President.

7. President Reviews Portfolio

- a. The President will review all recommendations and the candidate's

response (if applicable) and will make the final administrative decision. The decision will be

- i. to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
 - ii. to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
 - iii. to deny promotion to Professor.
- b. The President will communicate the decision to the candidate in writing by the date specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar.